



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1459
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,813	02/16/2000	Shuji Goto	P99,2486	6161

26263

7590

05/06/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

CREPEAU, JONATHAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/504,813

Applicant(s)

GOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan S. Crepeau

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7,8 and 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7,8 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action addresses claims 7, 8, and 10-17. Claims 7-17 remain rejected over the prior art for substantially the reasons of record. Accordingly, this action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 7, 8, 10-13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narang et al (U.S. Patent 6,168,885) in view of Schneider et al (U.S. Patent 6,180,281) in view of Gozdz et al (U.S. Patent 5,840,087) in view of Kawakami et al (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0064710).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, In Figure 1 and in column 11, lines 4-12, Narang et al. generally teach a process for making a battery comprising the steps of coating a negative electrode with electrolyte (26), coating a positive electrode with electrolyte (36), and laminating the two electrode/electrolyte sheets together under heat (42) so as to form a single, continuous electrolyte. The laminating step is considered to be anticipatory of the claimed "pressing" step, since the artisan would immediately be able to envision such a pressing step. Regarding claims 8, 13, and 16, in column 10, lines 34-55, the reference teaches that the solid polymer electrolyte contains a plasticizer (swelling solvent) such as ethylene carbonate (EC) and dimethylcarbonate (DMC). Regarding claims 8 and 16, in column 11, lines 7 and 8, it is further taught that the

electrolyte is gelled. Regarding claims 11 and 16, the electrolyte salt may comprise LiPF_6 , LiBF_4 , and LiAsF_6 , among others (see col. 10, line 23). Regarding claims 12 and 16, the electrolyte matrix polymer is preferably polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) (see col. 10, line 34).

The reference does not expressly teach that the electrode/electrolyte sheets are wound in the lengthwise direction of the sheets (i.e., that the laminate is spirally-wound), or that the electrolyte layers are formed into a "seamless" layer, as recited in claims 7 and 17. The reference further does not expressly teach that both sides of each electrode are coated with electrolyte (claims 7 and 17), or the temperature or duration of the lamination (claims 7, 10, and 17).

The patent of Schneider et al. is generally directed to composite separator and electrode structures comprising seamless interfaces between the separator and electrodes (see abstract).

The patent of Gozdz et al. is directed to methods of making laminated batteries. As shown in Figure 6, an electrode (67) is coated on both sides with electrolyte material (64) prior to lamination. Gozdz et al. further teach a lamination temperature of about 100-120 degrees C in column 5, lines 52-55.

The publication of Kawakami et al. is directed to rechargeable lithium batteries (see paragraph 82). In paragraph 141, the reference teaches that the batteries can be spirally-wound.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the artisan would be motivated by the disclosure of Schneider et al. to form the electrolyte layers of Narang et al. into a "seamless" layer. In column 6, line 30 et seq., Schneider et al. teach that "the interfaces between the

advancing polymer boundaries having merged to lose completely any independent identity. The resulting structure is very pliant, translucent, and smooth, but extraordinarily strong, as shown in the Examples.” The reference further teaches in column 2, line 65 et seq. that “the resultant composite allows ions to freely migrate from the electrode domain through the separator domain during successive charging and discharging of the battery.” Accordingly, these teachings of Schneider et al. would motivate the artisan to form a “seamless” interface between the electrolyte layers of Narang et al.

Regarding the limitation that the electrodes are wound, the disclosure of Kawakami et al. would motivate the artisan to wind the electrodes of Narang et al. In paragraph 141, Kawakami et al. teach that “[i]n the case where the rechargeable battery is shaped in a spiral-wound cylindrical form, the anode, separator and cathode are arranged in the named order and they are spiral-wound and because of this, there are provided advantages such that the battery area can be increased as desired and a high electric current can be flown upon operating the charging and discharging.” It is further noted that Narang et al. teach in column 3, line 17, in a discussion of the prior art, that “[o]ften, the various cells are spiral wound before being provided with a protective coating.” Accordingly, the artisan would be motivated by these disclosures, particularly that of Kawakami et al., to wind the electrodes of Narang et al.

Regarding the limitation in claims 7 and 17 that both sides of both electrodes are coated with electrolyte, the artisan would be sufficiently motivated to perform this step with the electrodes of Narang et al. Narang et al. teach at column 11, line 9 that “as many layers as necessary can be laminated together to provide the desired capacity of the final electrochemical

cell.” This disclosure clearly indicates that both sides of each electrode may be coated (to result in, for example, a stacked cell configuration). Furthermore, as noted above, the artisan would be sufficiently motivated to use a spirally-wound configuration with the electrodes of Narang et al. In order to achieve such a configuration, the artisan would understand that an electrically insulating material would have to present on both sides of each electrode in order to prevent a short circuit. In view of Narang’s teaching of multi-layer cells above, the coating of electrically insulating, ion-conductive electrolyte material on both sides of each electrode would be an obvious way of eliminating such a short circuit. The artisan could further look to the patent of Gozdz et al., which, as noted above, teaches a double-sided electrolyte coating on an electrode in Figure 6. In column 6, line 39, Gozdz et al. teach that “prior to assembly and lamination at step (c), carrier films 62 are removed (not shown) to expose the unblemished surfaces of facing separator/electrolyte layers 64, 64 which may then be laminated under reduced temperature and pressure conditions to effect a homogeneous, cohesive bond completing battery cell 50.” Thus, it is noted that Gozdz et al. also teach a “seamless” bond in addition to a double-sided electrolyte coating.

Regarding the temperature and time limitations recited in claims 7, 10, and 17, as noted above, Gozdz et al. teach a lamination temperature of “about 100°-120°C” at column 5, line 55. However, in column 2, line 13, Gozdz teaches that “therefore, a lower assembly preheat temperature may be utilized, e.g., in the range of about 100°-120°C.” Thus, this disclosure indicates that the disclosed temperature range is merely *exemplary* and can be subjected to further manipulation by a person of skill in the art. The disclosure further indicates that “lower”

preheat temperatures are suitable. As such, the artisan would possess sufficient skill to manipulate the lamination temperature of Gozdz, thereby rendering the claimed value of 70°C obvious. Further, the recitation of heat treatment “for ten minutes” is also not considered to distinguish over the references. The artisan would possess sufficient skill to manipulate the duration of the heat treatment in order to affect the characteristics of the resulting electrolyte bond while at the same time being mindful to not damage other battery components by excessive exposure to heat.

3. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narang et al. in view of Schneider et al. in view of Gozdz et al. in view of Kawakami et al. as applied to claims 7, 8, 10-13, 16, and 17 above, and further in view of Oliver et al. (U.S. Patent 5,688,293).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Narang et al. teach that the sealing and charging steps of the battery may be “conventional” (see col. 11, line 12). However, the reference does not expressly teach that the electrodes are inserted into a film pack (claim 14), or that the electrolyte layers are integrated with each other after being inserted into the film pack (claim 15).

Oliver et al. is directed to a method of making a gel electrolyte battery. In column 5, line 22 et seq. and in each Example, the reference teaches that discrete cells are packaged between metal foil laminate sheets to enclose the cell, and then the battery is exposed to a compression and heating step so as to seal the package and cure (gel) the battery cell.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because the artisan would be motivated to use the packaging and heating steps of Oliver in the process of Narang et al. First, as noted above, Narang et al. teach that the battery can be made in a "conventional" manner. Additionally, the sealing of the package and the curing (gelling) of the electrolyte of Oliver are combined into one step. The artisan would realize that, applied to the process of Narang, this step would result in a time and energy savings in making the battery. Thus, the artisan would be motivated to use this step in the process of Narang.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants generally assert that none of the references teach or fairly suggest the claimed temperature of 70°C. However, as set forth above, it is believed that Gozdz renders this value obvious to a skilled artisan since this reference discloses a non-limiting temperature range of 100°-120°C and guides the artisan to use "lower" temperatures relative to a range of 120°-150°C (see also col. 2, line 4 of Gozdz). As such, the claimed subject matter is still rendered obvious by the references.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Crepeau whose telephone number is (571) 272-1299. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached at (571) 272-1414. The phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-1700. Documents may be faxed to the central fax server at (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Application/Control Number: 09/504,813

Page 9

Art Unit: 1746

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jonathan Crepeau
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746
May 3, 2005